P. Ø4

PATENT 09/213,856



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Before the Examiner:

Scott A. Morgan et al.

Angela Armstrong

Serial No.: 09/213,856

Group Art Unit: 2654

Filed: December 17, 1998

Intellectual Property

Title: SPEECH COMMAND INPUT

Law Department - 4054

RECOGNITION SYSTEM FOR

International Business

INTERACTIVE COMPUTER DISPLAY WITH INTERPRETATION OF

Machines Corporation 11400 Burnet Road

ANCILLARY RELEVANT SPEECH

Austin, Texas ,78758

QUERY TERMS INTO COMMANDS

Date: 06 18 02

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

J. B. KRAFT

Signature

Date

RESPONSE

Assistant Commissioner of Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This is in response to the Office action mailed April 11, 2002.

With respect to the provisional rejection of the claims based upon obvious type double patenting over the combination copending Application SN. 09/213,858 in view of

AT9-98-343

PATENT 09/213,856

Morin et al., the Examiner indicated that this rejection will be withheld until conflicting claims are found to be allowable. Since, there is a common assignee of the cited application and the present application, assignee is prepared to submit any appropriate terminal disclaimer upon allowance of claims.

The Final Rejection herein has been withdrawn after Applicants' Brief on Appeal had been had been filed and the present new rejection issued. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Brant et al. (US 5,386,494) in view of Morin et al. (US 5,748,841).

In this connection, Applicants are disappointed in the Withdrawal of the Appeal and the reopening of prosecution for the citation of the Brant reference which substantially has no effect on the issues of the Appeal.

The present invention is directed to speech recognition computer systems in which specified actions are performed on the computer controlled display in response to recognized specific spoken commands. In addition, the present invention provides for each true command, an associated set of relevant speech terms which are not commands. The system then detects the true commands, and also detects the relevant speech terms, i.e. non-commands. The system then simultaneously displays both the recognized true commands as well as the true commands for which a relevant associated speech term was recognized. This gives the user the opportunity to easily select commands relevant to recognized speech terms on an equal basis with the normally recognized commands.

While the system of Brant does detect and distinguish true commands from speech utterances which are not such

PATENT 09/213,856

commands, the reference makes no suggestion as to how such non-commands may be used for any advantageous purpose. The main purpose of Brant's distinguishing non-commands from commands is to minimize the effects of unintentional or casual speech upon the ability of the system to recognize true commands. The Brant reference does not suggest providing for each true command, an associated set of relevant speech terms which are not commands or simultaneously displaying both the recognized true commands as well as the true commands for which a relevant associated speech term was recognized.

While Brant may display the recognized true commands, it in no way suggests the additional simultaneous display of commands associated with recognized non-command speech terms. The Examiners also concedes this point:

"Brant does not specifically teach associating non-command speech terms with an associated command and displaying relevant commands based upon the non-command speech term." (bottom of page 4. Office Action)

The Examiner relies on the Morin patent to make up for these deficiencies of the Brant reference. However, Morin's teaching is too complex to offer one skilled in the art any insight into or suggestion of Applicants' invention. Morin et al. relates to a complex process for heuristically teaching a user the command languages of computer operating systems as well as programming applications for such systems through spoken user input and feedback from the system.

The present invention is not heuristic; it does not teach itself anything. The associated relevant non-command speech terms are not developed by the system but are provided by the user. The Examiner fails to specifically point out where in Morin's elaborate teaching of a heuristic

. 3

PATENT 09/213,856

speech recognition system is there a suggestion of the deficiencies of the Brant teaching. The primary portion of Morin pointed to by Examiner (Col. 19, line 20 -Col. 20, line 64) works with interactively with users via displays to build commands. As the legal or true commands are being built, the user gets a menu of possible next words when he selects and enters each sequential word in the command phrase being built. Applicants fail to see how such a procedure suggests providing for each true command, an associated set of relevant speech terms which are not commands or simultaneously displaying both the recognized true commands as well as the true commands for which a relevant associated speech term was recognized.

Although the procedure of the present invention appears to be much simpler than the heuristic process of Morin, that simplicity alone should not render it obvious over Morin.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims $^{\circ}$ 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, and 15 are in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

B. Kratt Registration No / 19,226 Attorney for VApplicants

(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Leslie Van Leeuwen IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054 IBM Corporation 11400 Burnet Road Austin, Texas 78758

ÀT9-98-343